THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. I. } **MADRAS, MAY 1898.** { **No. 12.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA-BHA'SHYA.

(Continued from page 246).

Adhikarana 4.

(Objection) (*q*);—In that case the drift of the Vedantic teaching being an injunction, it cannot be held that Vedantas teach Brahman. It has, however, been contended that just as by means of the eye, by which we perceive *rúpa* or colour, the underlying substance (dravya) is perceived, so also Brahman may be taught by Vedântas which point to an injunction as their special aim. But this contention is untenable; for the eye is a pramâna or an organ of perception as regards everything that comes in contact with it. Not so is the S'abda or revelation. This latter becomes a pramâna or authority only as regards that which constitutes the *drift* of all its teaching. Wherefore it is not possible for Vedântas both to teach who Brahman is and to enjoin the act of knowing Brahman.

(Answer):—No: because we find that passages like "he should offer *samits* or fuel"* have a double aim, namely, to enjoin the five prayâjas themselves and to enjoin also the order of their observance, therefore it is but right that the vedantic texts also should both inform us as to what the nature of Brahman is and enjoin the act of knowing Brahman as leading to moksha.

(Objection):—(*r*) Brahman being known from the text itself, an injunction of Brahmajñâna is of no use, inasmuch as the aim of the injunction can be achieved without such an injunction, by the knowledge already obtained otherwise, (*i. e.* by an independent study of the texts themselves).

(*q*) The Bhàshyakàra has thus far expounded the view of the so-called Vedântins. He now proceeds to remove, by means of objections and refutations thereof, such points as he does not approve of in the view just described and to establish in his own way the proposition that Vedànta both teaches Brahman and enjoins His Upâsanâ. The first objection has been raised and answered with a view to show that the illustration of the eye is inappropriate owing to a difference between Veda and sensuous perception as to their authority concerning their respective revelations, and that the same proposition can only be established by an appeal to other instances in the Veda itself in which two different propositions are inculcated in the same sentence.

* Taittirîy-Samhitâ I. vi. 1.

(*r*) Now the Bhâshayakára opposes the doctrine of the injunction that Brahman should be known by means of Vedánta, with a view to establish his own doctrine that the aspirant should meditate upon Brahman after acquiring a knowledge of Him by means of the Vedânta.

(*Answer*) :—Not so; for, though Brahman is known indirectly (parokshatvena) from the texts, it is right that there should be an injunction of the act of jñâna with a view to the sâkshât-kârâ or an intuitive realisation of Brahman. It may be asked, what is the difference? We answer: the knowledge produced by the texts (s'abda) cannot cause sâkshât-kâra; on the other hand, it is jñâna, of the form of Upâsanâ or continuous meditation, which alone can produce sâkshât-kâra. Accordingly the S'ruti says:

"By meditating, the Muni goes to the source of all beings, the witness of all, beyond all darkness." *

"By churning with Jñâna alone does the wise man burn up the bond (pâs'a)." *

"Knowing the Deva, the Shining one, he is released from all bonds (pâs'as)." †

"Knowing Him, the Lord, they become immortal." ‡

Accordingly in the passage,

"Brahman should be learnt from the passages of S'ruti, reflected upon by reasoning, then after reflection meditated upon: these are the means to dars'ana or intuitive perception,"

the smriti shows that it is *nididhyâsana* or intense meditation, inseparably associated with the knowledge produced by *S'ravana* and *Manana*, (*s*)—by the processes of learning and reflecting,—which produces sâkshât-kâra or direct perception of Brahman. Wherefore Jñâna, of the form of Upâsanâ, calculated to produce the result of moksha, is enjoined in the following passages:—

"In the self (*t*) should he see the Atman." §

"S'ambhu should be contemplated in the middle of ákâs'a." ||

"Seeing that all this (Universe) has its birth, its dissolution, and its being, in Him, every one, tranquil-minded, should worship Him." ¶

"Do thou worship, O Prâchîna-yogya." *

Similarly in such passages as "the knower of Brahman attains to the Supreme" * the nature of Brahman, His Upâsanâ and the effect thereof are taught. Otherwise (*u*) how can either the attainment 'of all desires' as the result 'equally with Brahman' (*v*) who is described as the 'True,' or the sâkshât-kâra of such a Brahman, be achieved? Such passages as

"Truth, wisdom, and endless is Brahman" †

"Bliss is Brahman" ‡

"Brahman is He whose body is âkâsa, who is the existent, who delights in Prâna, whose joy is manas" §

"Hail to the Reality, the Truth, the Supreme Brahman, dark and yellowish in person, having semen above, diverse-eyed," ||

propound—as shown by upakrama and other tâtparya-lingas or marks showing what the special aim of Vedantic teaching is—Brahman as one who is by nature Truth, Wisdom and Bliss, who delights in Himself, in whom all taint of pain is absent, who is all good itself, who is dark and yellowish because associated with the inseparable Parama-S'akti or Supreme-Energy, who is diverse-eyed as possessed of three eyes. Such passages as.

"He who knows (Brahman) seated in the cave, etc." ¶

"Thus do thou worship, O Prâchîna-yogya" **

enjoin His Upâsanâ which is inseparable from Jñâna. And passages like, "he attains all desires" tell us of the attainment of all desires by the worshippers (Upâsakas). Wherefore it is but just that there should be an injunction of Upâsanâ inseparably asso-

* Kaivalya-Upanishad.

† S'vet Upanishad 1—8.

‡ S'veta Upanishad 3—7.

(*s*) Jñàna is first produced by *Sravana* or hearing, and then strengthened by *Manana* or reflection and reasoning. The Jñàna being the cause of *nididhyâsana* or intense meditation of Brahman the latter is said to be inseparable from it.

(*t*). In the self: In the body, in the middle of the àkas'a of the heart.

§ Bri. Upanishad 4—5—23.

|| Atharvas'ikhà—Upanishad.

¶ Chh. Upanishad 3—14.

* Taitti. Upanishad 1—6.

(*u*) *Otherwise*: It is but reasonable that the Vedânta should enjoin the Upâsanâ of Brahman. Without the Upâsanà no sàkshàt-kàra is possible, and the whole exposition of Brahman would be useless if no means of reaching Him be taught. If, therefore, the scriptures which expound Brahman should serve any human end, it can be only by enjoining the means of reaching him. This reasonableness is one of the *lingas* showing that Vedànta enjoins Upàsanà.

(*v*) *All desires*: Equal to the aggregate of pleasures accessible to all beings from man up to Hiranyagarbha: *Equally with Brahman*: *i. e.*, the liberated soul enjoys all the bliss that Brahman enjoys.

† Taitti. Upanishad 2—1.

‡ Bri. Upanishad 3—9—28.

§ Taitt. Upanishad 1—6.

|| Mahànárayana 12.

¶ Taitt. Upanishad 2—1.

** Taitt. Upanishad 1—6.

ciated with Jñâna, in the following form:—A mumukshu or seeker of moksha, performing his own duties disinterestedly, eschewing all prohibited and interested acts, endued with the purity of mind resulting from the observance of acts enjoined in the S'ruti and Smriti, saturated with Bhakti for Parama-S'iva which is rendered possible by the subjugation of the body and the senses,—thus prepared, a mumukshu should know of Para-Brahman called S'iva from the essential portion of the S'ruti and meditate upon Him. The use of the epithet *S'iva* here (in the Bhâshya) is intended to show that the diverse-eyed Brahman is the repository of supreme purity and good and is therefore, for mumukshus, the sole object of Upâsanâ. Accordingly in a passage in the Atharva-sikha.—

"S'iva alone, the source of good, should be meditated upon, abandoning all else."—

it is taught that the Being denoted by the word *S'iva* should alone be meditated upon. Otherwise, how can the cessation of Samsâra be brought about? S'iva is the seat of the unsurpassed good which is free from all taint of evil, and a knowledge of Him leads to moksha as its result, as said in the passage:

"When men should roll up the ether like a hide, then only, without first knowing God, there could be an end of pain."*

The passage:

"S'iva alone, the source of all good, should be meditated upon, abandoning all else,"

excludes all beings other than S'iva as not worthy the aspirant's while to know or meditate upon. Wherefore those who are desirous of moksha has to know and meditate upon S'iva alone, the Para-Brahman.

There can, therefore, be no opposition to the view that a harmonious concatenation of all tests which go to show what the drift of the Vedantic teaching is, proves that the Vedântas point both to Brahman and to an injunction of His worship.

Adhikarana—5.

With a view to prevent a possible objection that the aforesaid definition of Brahman is too wide as applying to Pradhâna as well, the Sûtrakâra says:

Because of thinking, (Sat is) not the unrevealed (I. i. 5.)

The subject of discussion in this section is the following passage of the Chhândogya Upanishad:

"Sat (existent) alone, my dear, this at first was, one only, without a second............It thought, may I be many."*

Here the *doubt* arises as to whether the Being spoken of as *Sat*, the Existent, and said to have existed in the beginning and to be the cause of the whole of this universe, is Brahman or Pradhána.

(*Pûrvapaksha:*)—It is but right that Pradhána is the cause of the world, as described elsewhere in the S'ruti:

"Unborn, one, red, white and black, giving birth to manifold progeny similarly formed.................."†

Here it is taught that the Sânkhya's Prakriti, composed of *rajas*, *sattva* and *tamas*—as indicated by the red and other colours—is the producer of manifold progeny. In accordance with this passage we should understand that it is Pradhàna which is the cause of the world, spoken of here (in the Chhandogya-Upanishad) as the *Sat*. We may even explain that the Pradhàna possesses, in virtue of *rajas* and *sattva* contained in it, the powers of intelligence and action (Jñâna -S'akti and Kriyá-S'akti) which are indispensable in the cause of the world. It stands to reason that the unintelligent Pradhàna should become transformed (parinâma) into the world, not the Supreme Lord, the Immutable Intelligence;—parinàma (transformation) being only a vikâra or modified form of the cause. Thus both reason and revelation lead us to the conclusion that it is the Pradhàna which is spoken of as Sat and is the cause of the world.

As against the foregoing view, we hold as follows: the *unrevealed*, *i. e.*, the Pradhána established by pure *anumâna* or inference, is not the thing spoken of as the *Sat* and described as the cause of the universe; but it is the intelligent Brahman (that is spoken of as Sat); for 'thought' is predicated of the *Sat* in the words "It thought, may I become many." ‡ In the unintelligent Pradhána, indeed, there cannot exist thought which is the property of a conscious entity.

It is not right to contend that, because of the passage "Giving birth to manifold progeny similarly formed," it is the Prakriti of the Sànkhya that is here spoken of as the cause of the universe. For, in Sûtra I. iv. 8 we shall show that it is only that Pra-

---

* S'vetâsvatara-Upanishad 6—20.

* Chh. 6—2.

† Mahânârâyana Upanishad 12

‡ Chh. Upanishad 6—2.

kriti which has the Supreme Lord for its impelling cause that can produce manifold progeny. Neither is it possible to maintain that, as made up of *rajas* and *sattva*, Pradhàna is endued with the potencies of action and intelligence; for, the Prakriti which is made up of the three gunas cannot possess *sattva* and *rajas* quite exclusive of *tamas*. It being admitted that Prakriti is the *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* in a state of equilibrium, it is idle to say that when *tamas* becomes quiescent and *rajas* and *sattva* get excited, Pradhàna becomes endued with intelligence and activity. The objection that the transformation of the Supreme *immutable* Lord would subject Him to vikâra or change is a mere play of ignorance: there is no fear of our being led to such a conclusion, inasmuch as we hold that the Supreme Lord is the cause when invested with the potencies of subtle *chit* and *achit* in their undifferentiated state as to name and form, and He is the effect when invested with the potencies of grosser *chit* and *achit* which are differentiated in name and form.

(*Objection*): From the determinate exclusion implied in such passages as the "existent *alone*, my dear, this at first was, one *alone*, without a second" we learn that the thing spoken of as *Sat*, "the Existent" has no specific attributes. How can It be spoken of as the cause containing within it the universe in its subtle form?

(*Answer*): The determination conveyed by "Existent *alone*" is not meant to exclude specific attributes; but it is meant to remove the idea that the cause is not the non-existent; there being persons who by ignorance cherish that idea, as set forth in the S'ruti:

> "Non-existent verily this at first was; thence, indeed, the existent sprang up."*

Moreover, how can Brahman—as described in the passage:

> "The existent alone, my dear, this at first was, one alone, without a second,"—

be without specific attributes? In this passage the word 'was' shows a specific act, and the words "at first" show a specific time. The determination implied in "one alone" is intended to exclude an external ruler, and the words "without a second" indicate that it is the *Upâdâna* or material cause of the universe. Hence also the specific attributes of Omniscience and infinite power; for how, without the specific attributes of Omniscience and all-powerfulness, can Brahman constitute the twofold cause of the universe? Or, (the same thing may be established in another way): it cannot be rightly held that the word 'Sat' which is made up of a *base* and *termination* refers to only one thing; the word 'Sat' being intended to denote two things by means of its base and termination. Accordingly, the learned have declared as follows:

> "S'akti and S'iva are denoted by the base and the termination of the word 'Sat' These two constitute Brahman, as together forming, by their harmonious union, the essence of the whole universe."

The conclusion, therefore, is that the Supreme Lord Himself invested with the potencies (S'akti) of the Universe—chit and achit in their gross and subtle forms,—and thus forming the cause and the effect, is the thing denoted by the word 'Sat.'

Again an objection is raised and answered:

If (you regard it) figurative, (we say) no, because of the word 'Atman.' (I. i. 6.)

(*Objection*):—It has been stated that, because no act of thinking is possible in Pradhàna which is insentient, it is the sentient Supreme Brahman that is the cause, spoken of as the '*Sat*' or Existent. Now, this view is quite inconsistent. For, just as in the statements "that *light* thought" and "those *waters* thought," thought is figuratively predicated of insentient objects, so also it may be held that thought is figuratively predicated of Pradhána.

(*Answer*):—No, because of the word 'A'tman denoting a sentient being. The S'ruti starts with the words "the existent, my dear, this at first was," and concludes thus, "He is the A'tman; That thou tar.' Even as to the light etc., the predicate of thought is not figurative, since the sentient Supreme Lord runs through them as their A'tman or essential Soul.

(*Objection*):—It has been shown that, even admitting that the predicate of thought is figurative, it is not possible to maintain that the insentient Pradhána is the existent and is the cause of the Universe, because of the word "A'tman" implying that the cause is a sentient being. Granted that the word 'A'tman' cannot denote the insentient Pradhána; but the sentient Jiva or individual soul can be denoted primarily by the word 'A'tman.' Wherefore, it is the sentient Jiva that is spoken of as the existent and the cause of the universe.

* Tait Upanishad 2—7.

(*Answer*) :—In reply the Sûtrakàra says :—

(The Sat is not Jiva,) it being taught that the devotee thereof attains Moksha (I. i. 7).

The passage,

"For him there is only delay so long he is not delivered (from the body)" *

teaches that he who is devoted to the Being spoken of as the 'Sat' attains to Moksha. Wherefore neither Pradhâna nor Jîva is referred to by the word 'Sat.' Not even they who hold Pradhâna to be the cause can admit that the devotee of Pradhâna attains to moksha holding as they do that Pradhâna is a thing to be avoided. Neither can a devotee of Jîva attain Moksha, Jîva being excluded from the passage,

"S'iva alone, the source of all good, should be contemplated, abandoning all else." †

Again, the Sûtrakára states quite clearly the reason for discarding Pradhâna :

And (Sat is not Pradhana), there being no declaration that (the Sat) is to be abandoned. (I. i. 8.)

If the Pradhâna were intended to be taught here, then it (Sat) would have been spoken of as a thing to be avoided. Whereas in the sentence "That thou art" the 'Sat' is spoken of as an object of contemplation leading to Moksha. Wherefore it stands to reason that Pradhâna is not (the thing spoken of as 'Sat').

Moreover, in the case of Pradhâna there is some inconsistency, as the Sûtrakàra says :—

Because of inconsistency with the proposition.—(I. i. 9)

There is another reason why Pradhâna cannot be the thing denoted by the word 'Sat'; the reason being that it would involve a contradiction of the original proposition asserting that, the One being known, all is known. The passage "whereby the unheard of becomes heard" ‡ asserts that the knowledge of the thing denoted by the word 'Sat' leads to a knowledge of all things, sentient and insentient, these latter being the effect of that one thing. This would be impossible if Pradhâna were the cause, inasmuch as Pradhâna cannot be the cause of the sentient existence.

(*Objection*) :—The cause, Pradhâna, being known, all this—the effect thereof—which is insentient and subject to change becomes known. When the clay, for instance, is known, its effect, the pot etc., is known.

* Chh. Upanishad. 6—2...14.
† Atharvasikhâ.
‡ Chh. Upanishad 6—1.

What inconsistency, then, is found here? In reply the Sûtrakára says :—

Because of dissolution.—(I. i, 10.)

For the following reason, too, Pradhâna is not the thing denoted by the word 'Sat'; for the passage

"Learn from me the true nature of sleep (svapna). When a man sleeps here, then, my dear son, he becomes united with the Sat, he is gone to his own (self). Therefore they say '*svapiti*,' he sleeps." *

speaks of the dissolution of the sentient Jíva when he becomes one with the Sat. Dissolution means absorption. The sentient cannot attain dissolution in the insentient Pradhâna. Wherefore 'Sat' does not refer to Pradhâna.

It is the Supreme Lord that is referred to by the word 'Sat,' not Pradhâna. So the Sûtrakàra says :—

The usage being the same.—(I. i. 11.)

Just as in this Upanishad the word 'Sat' is taken to mean the Supreme Lord, so in other Upanishads, too, 'Sat' refers to the same thing (*i. e.*, the Supreme Lord), as for example in the passages like

"Purusha verily is Rudra, the *sat*, the adorable. Hail! Hail!!" †

Wherefore it is verily the Supreme Lord who is denoted by the word 'Sat.'

In this (*i. e.*, the Chhàndogya) Upanishad it is plainly said that everything takes its birth from the A'tman referred to by the word 'Sat.' So the Sûtrakára says :—

And it being also revealed.—(I. i. 12).

Here, too, the S'ruti beginning with the words "From A'tman is Prâna, from A'tman is âkâs'a" concludes with the words "from A'tman alone is all this." ‡

Therefore Brahman Himself is spoken of as the cause of the universe and is referred to by the word 'Sat,' not Pradhâna.

Adhikarana—6

Here (in the adhikarana just closed) it has been objected that the definition of Brahman as the cause of the universe, which can be learned from scriptures alone, is too wide as applying to the Tântric Pradhâna as well; and arguments based on the sentiency (of the

* Chh. Upanishad 6—8.
† Mahànà. Up.
‡ Chh. Upanishad 7—25.

cause of the Universe) have been adduced with a view to show that the definition is not too wide as applying to Pradhâna. The next adhikarana proceeds to show that, as in the case of insentient Pradhâna so also the definition is not too wide as applying to sentient Jîva either :

A'nandamaya (is Parames'vara) because of repetition.—(I. i. 13.)

In A'nanda-valli, in the passage beginning with "From this A'tman, verily, âkâs'a was born" and ending with "Beyond that A'tman made up of intellect, there is another inner A'tman which is blissful,"* a certain A'tman, blissful and hidden within *annamaya* (physical) and other sheaths, is spoken of as the cause of the whole creation including âkâs'a.

Thet *doubt* arises as to whether the 'blissful a'tman' is Jìva or Parames'vara.

The *primâ facie* view is that it is Jíva, because the attributes of Jîva are found described here. For example, in the passage beginning with "From earth plants, from plants food, from food the person," † we find described the body made up of five members, and so on. Here *annamaya* refers to the physical body, *prânamaya* to prâna within the physical body, *manomaya* to manas within prâna, *vijñânamaya* to buddhi within manas; and *ânandamaya* is the Jiva himself, the basis of all these,—of *annamaya etc.* The representation of *annamaya* and other A'tmans as made up of head and so on is intended for meditation. Abundance of food etc. is described as the fruit of the meditation of *annamaya* etc. as Brahman. It may be asked how can Jiva, immersed in pain—in the ocean of samsâra—be spoken of as *ânandamaya*? But there is no room for any such objection. The word 'ânanda' denotes Supreme Brahman, as said by the S'ruti- "ânanda is Brahman." ‡ As the suffix 'maya' implies modification (vikâra), *ânandamaya* refers to Jîva, who is the *kárya*,—the effect or emanation—of Brahman. If *ânandamaya* were to refer to Brahman who is ever endued with goodness, the prayer for purity offered in the words "may my annamaya, prânamaya, manomaya, vijñânamaya, and ânandamaya become pure" § would be useless. Wherefore this ânandamaya A'tman is Jîva, not Parames'vara.

A. Mahadeva Sa'stri, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Tait. Upanishad 2—1, 5.
† Tait Upanishad 2—1.
‡ Tait. Upanishad 3—6.
§ Mahana Upanishad 57.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 249*).

BHATTACHARYA'S STATEMENT.

Purva Mimamsa System.

1. We here set forth the doctrines as now extant in this sea-girt earth, of Jamini Bhagavan as expounded by his disciple Bhattacharya, to the effect that the Vedas alone are true and that there is no God and that by performing Karma heaven will be reached.

2. The souls have lust and other *Gunas* (attributes). If the Veda was given out by man, they cannot be accepted as true: as he is educated, he becomes intelligent and without education he will be something like a baby or a dumb man. (So it is impossible, man himself could have given out the Vedas).

3. If you say that he who made the Vedas is God and He is not a man, then, when He attains a body, He must be a man only and his measure of knowledge is as he is educated. If He gets no visible body, then He can have no (mouth to utter) and mind to think.

4. All the Devas, Sages and Siddhas and elementals, and everybody else assert that they never heard that the Vedas were revealed by anybody. This is what has been imparted from generation to generation. It could have no human author either, as it treats of future births and states.

5. In the Vedas are comprised all the six *angas* and the three *Upa-Vedas*. All knowledge is centred in it. It is eternal, having neither beginning nor end. It is ever consistent and in constant usage.

6. It contains rules and prohibitions, and the description of the true paths, and the various mantras and their respective Devas, and the description of the various sacrifices are contained in the Vedas and as such they cannot be all similar. When people understand all the past, present and future, the Vedas appear in some form in all its truth.

3. This last stanza proves that no man could have been the author of the Vedas as man derives all his knowledge from the Vedas themselves. And no God could have revealed it either, which if true, he must have a mouth and mind and senses like man to utter the Veda—in which He is reduced to the condition of man and the former objection again applies. So it is not only among those who disbelieve in the Vedas there are atheists but those within the fold also.

5. The six *angas*, are Numbers, Nirukta, Grammar, Chandas, Astronomy, and Kalpa. The three Upa-Vedas, *Ayur-Veda* (medicine) and *Thanur-Veda* (science of warfare) and *Gandarva-Veda* (music).

7. Observing faultlessly the rules of dividing the words of the Veda, the rules of pronunciation, the Karma prescribed by the Veda should be performed. Then the great boon of Moksha will be secured and all bonds (Pasa) surrendered.

8. The vast universe has neither beginning nor end and is not caused by any one and is eternal and filled with souls, inseparably united to Karma and manifests itself in the tatwas from earth etc.

9. The Soul is eternal and is omnipresent and is intelligent and is united to Buddhi and other Karanas and is pure and formless and attains bodies in accordance with its previous Karma and understands through the senses.

10. As grass and other leaves used as manure in the fields reproduce themselves, so the past Karma will attach itself to the soul in its next birth and produce fruits.

11. The daily rites performed by a man according to the law will secure happiness. He will secure all kinds of boon he desires, by performing Agnihotra. By performing Vedic sacrifices (yagnas) he will attain liberation.

12. By means of both the Gnana-kanda and Karma-kanda, a man can liberate himself. By pursuing Gnana marga alone one giving up rituals becomes an out-caste (sinner) and the Vedas themselves do not prescribe any rule of salvation for such a person.

13. The Vedas declare that performance of sacrifices by killing *pasu* is virtue; following this precept as true if one recites the indestructible mantras he will derive happiness as one, hungry, removes his craving by eating.

HIS REFUTATION.

1. Except your words there is no authority in the Veda itself that the Veda is uncaused (*Swayambhu*), if there is, you had better show me. The great Mahabharata itself is an example. In the same way the Mahabharata has an author and in the same way as we infer from the presence of things made of earth and cotton, that they were made by potters and weavers, so we infer that Veda was revealed by an author. And the Lord with the crescent moon is also the authority for the Word that the Vedas were revealed by Him.

2. If you say that the Veda was not revealed by God, then they will be merely noices like those heard from the sky without any meaning. And as such they will be faulty. If you say that the Veda spreads its light and makes itself known like a lamp then it must be limited in its nature. This is also what sage Kapila says. Then it must follow what he also says that they have a beginning and an end. How do you prove also that the Veda was formless at one time and became clothed in form at another time? What you have said is simply foolish.

3. You say the Vedas will appear united to a person, as you don't describe the person, even a frog is likely to utter your Veda. If you say that the Vedas do not mention a particular person as its vehicle, that it will be conveyed to a proper person who is proper and fit to receive it, it cannot be. Even when we receive clothes from distant islands we infer there must be a person who manufactured those clothes even though we have not seen them. So there must be an author for the Vedas.

4. You say the Vedas are uncaused as people of different countries speaking various languages accept the Vedas as true. So also are similar pots made in various countries. Hence there must be an author who understanding the words and their meaning reveals those words without fault. If you say the words and meanings become naturally combined as the flowers and their fragrance in a garland even then there must be a person who must choose the words, otherwise they will be merely like the unmeaning roar of the sea.

5. In the same way as we are united to our body so God dwelling in the universe as His body graciously revealed to us the Word or (Vedas) and having been revealed by the eternal uncaused Being, it has been the usage to call also the Veda as eternal and uncaused, in the same way as people regard any letter containing the command of the king as திருமுகம் (Royal presence itself).

6. If you say that the three higher castes of Brahmans etc., speak the language of the Vedas, then explain how the astrologers who come from the 4th caste learned their science and how is it also that in the North no caste is prohibited from reciting

12. Here Gnana marga simply means the belief in the Veda as eternal and uncaused.

1. Of course by inference and by Agama pramana it is proved that the Veda was revealed by God. The Agama praman, comprise the 28 Agama revealed by Siva Himself. Lord Siva has Five faces (Panchanana); from the lower 4 faces the 4 Vedas were uttered and from the upper one the 28 Agamas.

the Vedas. To say that the Veda containing every thing in itself is of the nature of sound and that it has no author is to say that persons came to being without a mother.

7. If you say that the soul is intelligent as it is united to the body, then it will be destroyed as the body is destroyed. If you say that the bodily organs themselves become united to the soul, then it has no such power. They became united by the intelligent action of a creator. Plants sprout from seeds in the rainy season and they all die out in the hot weather; so the body also dies. Hence the word cannot be said to be eternal.

8. If you say that the soul is omnipresent, then it cannot pursue the paths of virtue, enter heaven and be born again. Or if you say it fills the body as the fragrant smell a pot then it will follow that as the body decays the soul must also decay, but you are aware of Yogis leaving one's own body and entering another. As you have not understood the meaning of the Veda in full, your ideas are so confused.

9. As the acts performed by a man die with this body, how do you say that the past reproduce themselves. If you instance the case of manure, then you can as well say that the food eaten every day having been reduced to mere excrement, the excrement can again produce food. As the acts die with the body they cannot of themselves be united to the body in a future birth. There is a Gracious Lord who unites each to eat the fruits of his proper Karma as persons who employ labour give each man his wages according to the work turned out by him.

10. If you say that by performing sacrifices and knowing that the Veda is true you can attain final liberation, but this very performance will induce desire for wealth etc. which will in turn prevent your securing higher knowledge and thus lose all chances of final liberation. The more a man enjoys pleasure by securing wealth the more will his desire be to secure more wealth again. Similarly the desire to perform sacrifices to attain heaven will only induce the desire to perform Karma more and more.

J. M. NALLASAWMY PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

(*To be continued*).

TAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 250*).

சுகவாரி.

பாராதியண்டங்க ளத்தனையும்வைக்கின்ற
    பரவெளியினுண்மைகாட்டிப்
பற்றுமனவெளிகாட்டி மனவெளியினிற்றோய்ந்த
    பாவியேன்பரிசுகாட்டித்
தாராளமாய்நிறக நிர்சிந்தைகாட்டிச்
    சதாகாலநிட்டையெனவே
சகசநிலைகாட்டினை சுகாதீதநிலயந்
    தனைக்காட்டநாள்செல்லுமோ
காராரவெண்ணரு மனந்தகோடிகணின்று
    காலூன்றிமழைபொழிதல்போற்
கால்வீசிமின்னிப் படர்ந்துபரவெளியெலாங்
    கம்மியானந்தவெள்ளஞ்
சோராதபொழியவே கருணையின் முழங்கியே
    தொண்டரைக்கூவுமுகிலே
சுத்தநிர்க்குணமான பரதெய்வமேபரஞ்
    சோதியேசுகவாரியே. (அச)

84. O Ocean of Joy, the characterless Supreme Being of Transcendent Brightness!

Thou art the sole Merciful Lord whose boundless mercy streams forth like clouds in myriads of ways and directions and, with flashes of lightning, spreads itself all over the vast expanse of the sky, and does, incessantly, shower down bliss to Thy devotees with the inviting peals of thunder.

Thou wast so much pleased as to disclose to me the picturesque sight of the firmament of the *akas** wherein are made to figure themselves the innumerable worlds *earth* &c., and my etheric *mind* and my subject condition therein. Thou didst also bless me with an uninterrupted state of *mona* † and that of a systematic abstraction in *yoga*.‡

O Benefactor, it should, therefore, be no more considered premature that I could be at once placed in the Highest State of Supremest Bliss.

பேதித்தசமயமோ வொன்றுசொனபடியொன்று
    பேசாததுறவாகியே
பேசாதபெரியோர்க ணிருவிகற்பத்திலுற்
    பேசார்கள்பரமகுருவாய்ப்

* Akas—ether.

† Mona—death of the mind.

‡ Yoga—silent meditation as prescribed by the *yoga-sastra* (yoga science).

போதிக்குமுக்கண்ணுறை நேர்மையாய்க்கைக்கொண்டு
போதிப்பதாச்சறிவிலே
போக்குவரவறவின்ப நீக்கமறவசனமாப்
போதப்பதெவரையனே
சாதித்தசாதனமு மியோகியர்கண்மதென்று
சங்கிப்பராதலாலே
தன்னிலேதானு யயர்ந்துவிடுவோமெனத்
தனியிருந்திடினங்ஙனே
சோதிக்குமனமாயை தனையேவிளுலடிமை
சுகமாவதெப்படிசொலாய்
சுத்தநிர்க்குணமான பரதெய்வமேபரஞ்
சோதியேசுகவாரியே. (௮௫)

85. O Ocean of Joy, the characterless Supreme Being of Transcendent Brightness!

There are multifarious systems of Faith, not one of which agrees with the other. Hence it is that great sages do seclude themselves from the controversial world and set in to observe the vow of continued silence.

And Thou being the Three-eyed Lord Supreme didst think it fit to appear as the Holiest Guru and by a sacred Symbol didst initiate me spiritually. O! Blessed was the consequence which no teaching by word of mouth can produce. Unspeakably most beatific it was, plunging me in the *ananda** of eternity free from rebirth.

O God, the sadhanas resorted to until now are claimed by the yogins as theirs in a spirit of pride. For this reason, if I should desire to live the life of a recluse and transquillise myself with self-possession, the versatile mind of *maya*† is set to disquiet me and disturb me ‡

O my Master, at this rate I cannot get myself absorbed in Thy Love of Bliss.

அண்டமுடிதன்னிலோ பகிரண்டமதனிலோ
வலரிமண்டலநடுவிலோ
வன்னடுவிலோவமிர்த மதிநடுவிலோவன்ப
ரகமுருகிமலர்கடூவித்
தெண்டமிடவருமூர்த்தி நிலையிலோதிக்குத்
திகந்தத்திலோவெளியிலோ
திகழ்விந்துநாதநிலை தன்னிலோவேதாந்த
சித்தாந்தநிலைதன்னிலோ
கண்டபலபொருளிலோ காணுதநிலையெனக்
கண்டசூனியமதனிலோ
காலமொருமூன்றிலோ பிறவிநிலைதன்னிலோ
கருவிசரணங்களோயந்த
தொண்டர்களிடத்திலோ நீவீற்றிருப்பது
தொழும்பனேற்குளவுபுகலாய்
சுத்தநிர்க்குணமான பரதெய்வமேபரஞ்
சோதியேசுகவாரியே. (௮௬)

86. O Ocean of Joy, the characterless Supreme Being of Transcendent Brightness! Let me know where Thou wilt be manifest: Either in the summit of this universe or in the universes lying beyond it. Either in the region of the Sun or Agni (fire) or in the cool region of the Moon. Either in or outside the quarters or in the *Akas*. Or can I say that Thou art in the idols worshipped by Thy devotees with flowers with their hearts melting? Art Thou in the vindu the *Pranava* or in the Nâtham (sound)? Or in the Vedanta or Siddhanta? Or in all the visible objects of the world? Shall I say that Thou dost survive the decay of those objects or Thou art both in the Past, Present and Future? Dost Thou present Thyself at Thy creation of this *Prapancha* or in Thy self-controlled devotees who have become absorbed and lost in Thy Divine contemplation.

O my Lord, Thou must *Thyself* become my guide * to seek Thee out.

எந்தநாள்கருணைக் குறித்தாகுநாளளவு
மென்னிசயமெனைவாட்டுதே
யேதென்றுசொல்லுவேன் முன்னொடுபின்மலைவறவு
மிற்றைவரையாதுபெற்றேன்
பந்தமானதிலிட்ட மெழுகாகியுள்ளம்
பதைத்துப்பதைத்துருகவோ
பரமசுகமாவது பொறுப்பரியதுயரமாய்ப்
பலகாலுமூர்ச்சிப்பதோ
சிந்தையானதுமறிவை யென்னறிவிலறிவான
தெய்வநீயன்றியுளதோ
தேகநிலையல்லவே யுடைகப்பல்கப்பலாய்த்
திரையாழியூடுசெலுமோ

* Ananda—bliss; eternal delight.

† Maya—matter. Mind is matter—c.f. 39th verse.

‡ The Saint refers in this verse to the Doctrine of Grace and its observance being absolutely necessary for attaining the Highest Moksha. Mere knowledge or practice of yoga or mere *mona* of self-possession cannot take us *to The one*, since, *except through His Grace*, we cannot extricate ourselves from the thraldom of *maya* or matter. c. f. The Saint's couplet.

"ஆனந்த மானநின்னை யன்றியொரன் றையுன்னுத
மோனத்த மியேற்கு முத்தி பராபரமே."

(O The Supreme, the *mukti's* joy gets he,
Who *shall* in *mona* think on none but Thee).

c. f. also verses 36, 41, 42 and notes thereon.

* It is by God's Grace that we can seek Him out. *c. f.* Shvet. Upa. VI, 21. "The Sage Shvetasvatara, by the power of his austerity *and the Grace of God*, has verily declared to the most excellent of the four orders, the Supreme holy Brahma, who is adored as all in all by all the Rishis." *c. f.* Mr. Mead's Translation-*ibid*. "By power of meditation *and by favour of the God*, therefore Brahm knowing &c." *c. f.* "அவனருளாலேயவன்றாள்வணங்கி"—Saint Manikkavachakar. (Appealing to His mercy by the help of His Grace.)

சொந்தமாயாண்டநீ யறியார்கள்போலவே
துன்பத்திலாழ்த்தன்முறைறயோ
சுத்தநிர்க்குணமான பரதெய்வமேபரஞ்
சோதியேசுகவாரியே. (அஎ)

87. O Ocean of Joy, the characterless Supreme Being of Transcendent Brightness! O The Allwise, Thou only knowest with what extreme pain of anxiousness do I look forward to the Blessed day of Thy Grace.* I have not yet attained the changeless state of Peace and Happiness. Do Thou at once inspire me with the surest method of getting at it, to which I could readily and wilfully resort: Be it either the hard struggle of controlling my mind† and liquidising *it* to the state of inflamed bees-wax; or be it the senseless state of swooning often times.

O The Intelligence of my intelligence, Thou knowest my sincere belief in Thee and Thee alone as the Sole Lord without a Second. ‡

O my Grand Master, how uncertain and transient is my body! Let my voyage be done while it is sound. How can a wrecked ship be successfully steered through? Is it my lot still to be kept in bondage of *this* life?

எந்நாளுமுடலிலே யுயிராமுனைப்போ
லிருக்கவிலையோமனதெனு
மியானுமென்னட்பாம் பிராணனுமெமைச்சடம
தென்றுனைச்சித்தென்றுமே
யந்நாளிலெவனோ பிரித்தானதைக்கேட்ட
வன்றுமுதலின்றுவரையு
மநியாயமாயெமை யடக்கிக்குறுக்கே
யடர்ந்தரசுபண்ணியெங்கண்
முன்னுகநீயென்ன கோட்டைகொண்டாயென்று
மூடமனமிகவுமேச
மூண்டெரியுமனலிட்ட மெழுகாயுளஞ்சருகன்
முறைமையோபதினுயிரஞ்
சொன்னலுநின்னருளிரங்கவிலையேயினிச்
சுகம்வருவதெப்படிசொலாய்
சுத்தநிர்க்குணமான பரதெய்வமேபரஞ்
சோதியேசுகவாரியே. (அஅ)

88. O Ocean of Joy, the characterless Supreme Being of Transcendent Brightness! Art Thou not conscious of the reactionary pain caused to me by Thy still with holding Thy Grace from me? Oh, my dull rigid *mind* rails at me in this reproachful language: "Do not myself and my life prana coexist with you "ever since you began to *be* a soul in body? Some "one in bygone days began to discriminate us both "as the *object consciousness* from you as the *subject* "*consciousness.* From that moment forward you most "cruelly restrain us and subject us to your strict "and hard control. What have you gained thereby, "O Soul? Shame! and Shame it is to you!" *

O The All-merciful, this puts me to extreme torture and I have simply to wear away like the wax in flames. Is this *all* my worth and desert? In myriads of ways I have been crying for Thy Help. Why hast Thou not yet moved at me? O for the day of rest in *Thy* Supreme Bliss!

எங்குநிறைகின்றபொருள்.

அவனன்றியோரணுவு மசையாதெனும்பெரிய
வாப்தர்மொழியொன்றுகண்டா
லறிவாவதேதுசில வறியாமையேதிவை
யறிந்தார்களறியார்களார்
மௌனமொடிருந்ததா ரென்போலுடம்பெலாம்
வாயாய்ப்பிதற்றுமவரார்
மனதெனவுமொருமாயை யெங்கேயிருந்துவரும்
வன்மையொடிரக்கமெங்கே
புவனம்படைப்பதென் கர்த்தவியமெவ்விடம்
பூதபேதங்களெவ்விடம்
பொய்மெய்விதமகிதமேல் வருநன்மைதீமையொடு
பொறைபொறுமையுமெவ்விட
மெவர்சிறியரெவர்பெரியரெவருறவரெவர்பகைஞ
ரியாதுமுனையன்றியுண்டோ
விசுபரமிரண்டிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (அகூ)

GOD HEAD AS ALL-FILLING INTELLIGENCE.

89. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls† both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions. Were I to ascertain the true meaning of the sages' great maxim '*not an atom moveth but by Him,*' I

---

* c. f. Notes under 86th verse.

† Vide Ashtâ-anga Yoga described under 61st verse.

‡ The Saint alludes to the Sruti "E'kamêva-dvithîyam Brahma." The monists or idealists construe this to suit their rationalism-theory, to mean '*one without a second*' i. e., only one entity and there is nothing else. But why should they drop or miss "Brahma" in their interpretation? Because, otherwise, the true. Agamic interpretation "One *Brahma* without a second" *i. e* "without a Second (*Brahma*)," which supports both reason, argument, logic and experience, will suggest itself at once to them and contradict their own theory of self-made Godship. Pity it is that they don't see that the universally prevalent Doctrine of *Prayer to God* establishes the God to be different from us (souls or prayers) and to be also a Personal God *i. e.* not personal like ourselves but able to hear without ears like ours, to see without eyes like ours, to think or will without mind other art like ours &c.

*c. f. the notes to 4th Sutra in Sivagnana Botham (Translation).

† God is the Soul of souls (individuals.) Because, just as a soul's physical body moves as a living thing when the soul is within it and is identified with the soul by being called as 'John' or 'Rama' or 'Krishna' &c., so the whole universe (body, mind and souls or *he, she* and *it,*) moves as a living *whole* when its Soul (God), the Siva Sat united to His Sakti, pervades it (universe) as *such,* and not otherwise. It is then that the Universe or Nature is identified with God (its inner life) and is called God Himself. By ignorance or bigotry or prejudice some persist in saying that God is the universe *in substance* i.e., essentially. In other words, the essence of the God and the essence of the universe are one and the same which is God. This is Pantheism leading to nihilistic idealism or Sûnyam (சூன்யம்.)

should be fully convinced of the sound reasons of these manifestations :—Why are their knowledge and ignorance, the wise and the ignorant? Some are great yogins of abstract meditation in silence and some who are of my stamp resort to incessant contraversies and exhortations as if born for nothing else. How to account for the origin of our mayaic * mind and its hardness and softness? Why was *this* world created and by *whom*? How is the differentiation of the subtile elements caused? How do we talk of virtue and vice—pleasure and pain—good and evil—envy and contentment—forbearance and resistence? Who are 'great' and who are 'low'? Who are 'friends and who are 'enemies'?

Directly or indirectly Thou art the Benevolent *cause* of all.

அன்னேயன்னே யெனுஞ் சிலசமயநின்னையே
ஐயாவையாவென்னவே
யலறிடுஞ்சிலசமய மல்லாதுபேய்போல
வலறியேயொன்றுமிலவாய்ப்
பின்னேதுமறியாம லொன்றைவிட்டொன்றைப்
பிதற்றிடுஞ்சிலசமயமேற்
பேசரியவொளியென்றும் வெளியென்றுநாதாதி
பிறவுமேநிலையென்றுந்
தன்னேரிலாததோ ரணுவென்றுமூவிதத்
தன்மையாங்காலமென்றுஞ்
சாற்றிடுஞ்சிலசமய மிவையாகிவேறதாய்ச்
சதாஞானவானந்தமா
யென்னேயெனேகருணை விளையாட்டிருந்தவா
றெம்மனோர்புகலவெளிதோ
விகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (௧௦)

90. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Some systems of faith referring to Thy Female Principle (Arul Sakti) would address Thee 'O mother! O mother'! and some referring to Thy Male Principle (Siva Sat) would cry out 'O Father! O Father'! While some would be grating like devils in an implacable manner to no purpose or aim of any kind. Some would say that Thou art the indescribable Brightness or Akas. Some assign to Thee the state of Natham (sound)&c. and some, the minuteness of an atom that finds no parallel. Some say that Thou art the three-fold divisions of Time-*Past, Present* and *Future.* *

O! Thou art and Thou art *not* all these! O Thou Omniscient Gnana of Bliss, all are Thy noble acts of Benevolence worthy of our esteem and beyond speech.

வேதமுடனாகம புராணமிதிகாசமுதல்
வேறுமுளகலைகளெல்லா
மிக்காகவத்துவித துவிதமார்க்கத்தையே
விரிவாவெடுத்துரைக்கு
மோதரியதுவிதமே யத்துவிதஞானத்தை
யுண்டுபண்ணுஞானமாகு
மூகமனுபவம்வசன மூன்றுக்குமொவ்வுமீ
துபயவாதிகள்சம்மத
மாதலினெனக்கினிச் சரியையாதிகள்போத
மியாதொன்றுபாவிக்கநா
னதுவாதலாலுன்னை நானென்றுபாவிக்கி
னத்துவிதமார்க்கமுறலா
மேதுபாவித்திடினு மதுவாகிவந்தருள்செ
யெந்தைநீகுறையுமுண்டோ
விகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (௧௧)

91. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

The Vedas and the Agama,† the Itihasa, ‡ the Purana § and other Smritis and schools of religion and philosophy—all invariably preach either the Dvaita or the Advaita doctrines. And the indispensable Dvaita Gnana (Sariya, Kiriya and Yoga) is the sole path or means to the Advaita. This is the truth that can stand or answer to *Sruti* or authority, *argument* and *experience* and as such is acceptable to both Dvaitist and Advaitist.

So I shall only pin myself to the *sadhana* ‖ of Sariya, Kiriya, Yoga and Gnana.

As a matter of fact I do identify myself by *Bhâvana* or conception with anything I shall fix my thoughts on, I can therefore be certain of attaining the True Advaita Moksha of becoming one with Thee for ever by *Thy* contemplation alone with no sense of 'I'¶

* Mind or Manas is one of the 96 Tatvas and as such is matter called achit *i. e.* non-intelligent thing having no activity except in conjunction with the soul which is distinct from andakaranas *Manas* (*Vide* Tatvas under verse 48) *c. f.* 4th Sutra, Sivagnana Botham (Translation.)

* *c. f.* verses 9 and 68. These 3 verses 9, 68, 90 contain the Vedic Truth 'God is all and not all' (எல்லாமாயல்லவுமாய்;) hence any attempt to define Him *here* is futile.

† Agama are 28 in number (*Vide* the list given in Sivagnana Botham)

‡ Itihasa (Mahabhârata Ramayana) is spoken of as the 5th Veda *c. f.* note to Vedas in 49th verse.

§ Purâna denotes 18 works treating chiefly of cosmogony and Divine geneology. They are Skandam &c.

‖ Sadhana—preparation or practice.

¶ This verse (91) explains the Supreme End of Sohambhavana (*i.e.* the Advaita End) holding at the same time the souls different from God and meets with no contradiction which other schools do. *c. f.* verses 36, 41 and 53 and Shvet. Upanishad Part I, 10.

O! my Benign Father, Thou wilt come and help me in the shape of any thing I would conceive of* and *that and that* alone will be my *Summum Bonum*.

சொல்லானதிற்சற்றும் வாராதபிள்ளையைத்
 தொட்டில்வைத்தாட்டியாட்டித்
தொடையினைச்சிள்ளல்போற் சங்கற்பமொன்றிற்
 றொடுக்குந்தொடுத்தழிக்கும்
பொல்லாதவாதனை வெனுஞ்சப்தபூமியிடை
 போந்துதலைசுற்றியாடும்
புருடனிலடங்காத பூவைபோற்றானே
 புறம்போந்துசஞ்சரிக்குஞ்
கல்லோடிரும்புக்கு மிகவன்மைகாட்டிடுங்
 காணாதுகேட்டவெல்லாங்
கண்டதாக்காட்டியே யணுவாசசுருக்கிடுங்
 கபடநாடகசாலமோ
யெல்லாமும்வலதிந்த மனமாயையேழையா
 மென்னாலடக்கவசமோ
விகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
 யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (கூஉ)

92. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions! How can I a poor dependent soul, think of ever controlling my mind *myself*†? Its mayaic nature is extremely turbulent: It would do and undo things with no constancy of purpose. Just like a foolish mother who would now choose to hush up her troublesome child by swinging it in a cradle and again would pinch its thigh and make it more annoying to herself. It (mind) does subject itself to the pains of seven *avasthas* ‡ or conditions of ignorance. It would wander with independence and self-indulgence like a wicked uncontrollable wife. It is sometimes much harder that flint or steel. It would presume to have actually seen whatever could have been only heard of. In short it is capable of all magical arts and hypocrisies.

கண்ணாரநீர்மல்கி யுள்ளநெக்குருகாத
 கள்ளனேனானுமோ
கைகுவித்தாடியும் பாடியும்விடாமலே
 கண்பனித்தாரைகாட்டி
யண்ணாபரஞ்சோதி யப்பாவுனக்கடிமை
 யானெனவுமேலெழுந்த
வன்பாகிநாடக நடித்ததோகுறைவில்லை
 யகிலமுஞ்சிறிதறியுமேற்
றண்ணாருநின்னதரு ளறியாததல்லவே
 சற்றேனுமினிதிரங்கிச்
சாசுவதமுத்திநிலை யீதென்றுணர்த்தியே
 சகசநிலைதந்துவேறொன்
றெண்ணாமலுள்ளபடி சுகமாயிருக்கவே
 யேழையேற்கருள்செய்கண்டா
யிகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
 யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (கூங)

93. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Though my tears gush forth from my eyes, yet my mind * is not moved and brought under my control. I should therefore be passed for a feigner only. All the same, O Merciful Lord, Thou knowest full well unlike *this* world, that I, taken in with love and devotion to Thee, danced and danced and clamoured 'O Lord! The Heavenly Light! O Father! Myself Thy slave!'

Thou wilt bestow Thy Grace upon me to make me perceive the True Everlasting Mukti of Bliss and *rest* myself *there* in ceaseless *ânanda* of total adhesion to none else but Thee.

R. SHANMUGHA MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued*).

"Over both self and that which perisheth the one God rules.
"By means of *meditation* and becoming one, in very truth,
"with Him *again and yet again*, at *last* cessation of the whole
"creation (maya) comes."

* *c.f.* "Thou Oh! Author of Good! art the sole creator of all. Thou, formless, *bearest the same form in all this infinite variety of forms*, just as the *sun* though reflected by 'many' a piece *of water* is still one and the same. To none therefore but Thee, Oh Lord, I fly for refuge!"—Kasi Khanda of the Skanda Purana. "Many are the names of God, and infinite the forms that lead us to know Him. In whatsoever name or form you desire to know Him, in that very name and form you will Know Him"— Precepts of Ramakrishna Paramahamsa Deva.

† Here the Saint establishes the weakness of Rationalistic theory of the Monists or Idealists and the indispensability of *God's Grace* to souls. A soul cannot get rid of its mala or pasa by itself as it is a universal law of nature that any thing like copper &c., cannot purify itself except by the help of an extraneous agent like the Alchemist's stone &c.

‡ The phrase in the text is "சப்த பூமி" (seven grounds). The 7 avasthas are (1) Bindu Jâgaram, (2) Mel-jâgaram, (3) Mahâ-jagaram, (4) Jagarâsvapnam, (5) Svapnam, (6) Svapna-jâgaram, and (7) Sushupti. They are respectively (1) the stage of God's vivifying of soul's intelligence, (2) the condition in which the soul becomes conscious, (3) Waking state, (4) Dreaming in the wakeful state, (5) Dream state, (6) Watchfulness in dream and (7) Dead sleep. These 7 conditions are suffered by the soul when it is in sakala or wordly state in the course of evolution.

* It is indicated here that the invoking of emotional agitations in body is conducive to finally conquering and internalizing the mind towards the Supreme Grace. This occurs when there is the springing up of a "strong and genuine bhakti *i. e., Love and devotion to God*".

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, MAY 1898.

THE NATURE OF THE DIVINE PERSONALITY.

'Satyam Gnanam Anantam Brahma.' Tait. Up. ii. 1.
'Bliss is Brahman.' Tait. Up. iii. 6.
'There is one Rudra only,—they do not allow a second—who rules all the worlds by his powers.'—Atharva Siras.
'God is Love.'

We begin where we left off in our last; and in discussing the nature of Saguna and Nirguna God, we will discuss the article of the Rev. Father Bartoli on 'God a Personal Being' which appeared in our last two issues, and the Editorial 'God and the Brahman' of the '*Brahmavadin*' of 16th ultimo, and the lecture of Swami Vivekananda, published in the last November number of the same magazine. These two parties occupy positions which seem almost distant as the poles and altogether irreconcileable. The Rev. Father asks, 'Why this mockery? Say with the fool that there is no God: that the existence of God is a sham a bubble, a false show, a cheat, a day dream, a chimera: because an Impersonal God is all this.' The learned Swami on the other hand says "The monistic theory has this merit that it is the nearest to a demonstrable truth in theology we can get. The idea that the Impersonal Being is in nature, and that nature is the evolution of that Impersonal is the nearest that we can get to any truth that is demonstrable, and every conception of God which is partial and little and *Personal* is comparatively not rational." In the editorial on 'God and Brahman,' a novel and a very presumptuous and misleading distinction in the use of the words God and Brahman is attempted, and the article concludes by saying that the worship of God, in all truth and in all love will never lead one to Moksha. "God is for such, and the Brahman is for those whose goal is perfect rest in perfect freedom." The presumption is in supposing that all other religionists except those of our learned brother's ilk do not postulate a Brahman and that their path, not being the 'Soham' path (Paramahamsa) will not lead one to Moksha, and it is also an unwarranted presumption in trying to restrict the use of the word God to what these people were till now calling the lower Brahman or Saguna Brahman or Personal God. The so-called Vedantists have an insidious way of recommending themselves to the favour of other people by bestowing judiciously a panegyric here and a panegyric there and at the same time they try to raise themselves above the shoulders of these others and at the latter's expense. They profess to be full of the milk of human kindness to professors of all creeds and sects and would willingly take them under their folds, what for? Only so that these people may see that what they profess to teach is the only true path containing the only truth, and that the other paths are—well—only no paths at all—only it will bring him to the same point of birth and death—containing a so-called—a phenomenal truth. And then what is the truth of these people worth after all. In itself, it is so shaky, or that they maul it so badly in their attempt to please every body that their truth (substance) becomes undistinguishable from untruth (phenomena); and this is exactly what the Swami's Guru, the Paramahamsa, the Mahatman says that the God—the Saguna—the Personal God is Maya or Sakti, indistinguishable as heat from fire and this God, or Maya is as such one with Brahman and so the distinction of Personal and Impersonal God is a distinction without a difference. (*Prabhudda Bharata p. 109*)!! It will be seen from a reading of the Rev. Father's article and from how these words are used in the *Brahmavadin* and the *Prabhudda Bharata* and that all these parties use the word Saguna as fully equivalent to Personal and Nirguna as equivalent to Impersonal Being; and a shade has never crossed these learned people's minds whether such rendering is quite the truth.

In our last we quoted a Swetaswatara Mantra in which the one God is called *Nirguna*. To-day we quote a Gita verse in which God is called Nirguna. "Beginningless, without qualities (Nirguna) the Supreme Self Paramatman) Imperishable, though seated in the body, O Kaunteya, worketh not nor is soiled." And the whole of chapters 13 and 14 have to be read to know the precise meanings

of Guna, Saguna and Nirguna. Verses 5 to 18 (chap. 14) define and describe the Gunas and their varieties—*Satva, Rajas* and *Tamas*. The three Gunas are Prakriti born. (14, 5., and 13. 19, from which are all action, causes and effects (13, 23) and from where are all bodies produced (14·20.) Satva is simply bodily (and mental) purity leading one to the desire of wisdom and bliss, (14·6), wisdom light streameth forth from the *Satvic* Man; and when he dies, he goes to the worlds of the Gods. (Vijnanaloka) and he rises upwards. The *Satvic* Man is still clothed in the material (Prakratic) body and is not yet released from his bonds, a Mukta. He is simply what the world esteems as a wise and great man. On the other hand, *Rajas* engenders passion, engenders thirst for life and is united to action—greed, outgoing energy, undertaking of actions, restlessness, desire—and he is again and again born among people attached to action. *Tamas* engenders ignorance, delusion, sloth Indolence, darkness, negligence &c., and he is born and enveloped in the vilest qualities. From this Prakriti and the three Gunas born of Prakriti, is distinguished the Purusha* Prakriti is the cause of causes and effects and instruments; and Purusha is the origin of pleasure and pain *i.e*, experiences or is attached to the qualities (guna) born of Prakriti and by this attachment or Pasa undergoes birth and death. So the reason for its undergoing birth and death is its attachment to the Gunas, Satva included. And the only way this Purusha (our *Brahmavadin's Brahman*), the Dweller in the body, can be freed from death unto everlasting life is by crossing over the three Gunas, (14-20) and by realizing that all action and change is the result of the three Gunas, (14-19) and that he himself (Purusha) is actionless or flawless (13-29) and that there is One higher than the three Gunas (Prakriti) (14-19, other than himself, The Highest Purusha, the Paramatman. He who pervadeth and sustaineth the three worlds, the indestructible Ishwara, (15-17), the Spectator, and Permitter, Supporter, Enjoyer, the Maheshwara, and this Beginningless, Nirguna Paramatman cannot perish though he is also seated in the body, as the Purusha or Atma is seated and is not attached to the three Gunas of which the bodies are created, and is not tainted nor soiled, as the Purusha was declared to be in verse (19, 20 and 21 of 13th chapter, just as Akasa is not soiled, though present in each and every thing. The Purusha (the *Brahmavadin's Brahman*, and our *Jivatma*) has also to realize to effect his freedom that he and Prakriti are all rooted in this One and proceed from it, (13—30) and though the One is neither rooted in Prakriti nor Purusha, being merely their efficient cause (9—5); This one God, the Swetaswatara says, (the passage will bear repetition) is "hid in every Bhuta pervading all, the inner *Atma* of every *atma*, Inspector of all deeds (spectator) in whom every thing dwells, (the support), the Witness, the Pure Intelligence and Nirguna Being; The Ishwara of Ishwaras, the Maheshwara, the God Supreme of Gods; the King of Kings the Supreme of the Supreme, the Isa of the Universe." "The eternal of Eternals, the consciousness which every being's conscious contains, who, one, of many the desires dispenses—The cause." "There shines not the sun nor moon and stars, nor do these lightnings shine, much less this fire. When He shines forth all things shine after Him; By Brahman's shining shines all here below." This same Being is described below as the all creator and protector, the refuge of all, who created Brahma himself and taught him his craft. This same Being is described by the Taitiriya Upanishad, as the only true and endless Intelligence, whose head is surely Love, Joy His right wing, Delight his left; Bliss is very self; and who is other than the *Atman* whom we know to be also *Sat, Chit* and *Ananda*. The Gita expressly speaks of God as being other than Purusha and Prakriti. The Swetaswatara also does the same. The Vedanta sutras, sums up the teaching of the Upanishads beyond all doubt in sutras 17 and 21 of first pada of first chapter and in the preceding sutras, God is described as Love, Intelligence, the-inside-of (antas) of everything, the Light, the Person, The Powerful One It is of Him, it is said by the Mundaka, that He perceives all, knows all, whose penance consists of knowledge; whom the Swetaswatara and Gita speak of having hands and feet on all sides, eyes and faces on all sides, now this is the God, who is described as the creator, protector and destroyer and the refuge, the truth, the Intelligence, and Love and Bliss, who is described as the supporter and spectator and seer and person and who is declared at the same time to be Nirguna, transcending both Prakriti and Purusha and Gods and Ishwaras. Now we will ask our Reverend Father Bartoli if he will

* In page 582. *Brahmavadin*, Purusha, Brahman, and Spirit are called synonymous terms. In page 247. Mr. Mahadeva Sastri's Gita translation, Sankara says, Purusha, Jiva, Kshetrajna, Bhokta, are all synonymous terms. So Brahman and Jiva are synonymous!!!

accept this Nirguna Being as the true God or the Saguna God or Ishwara (the lower one referred to in Mantra 7, section vi of Swetaswatara ; whom we showed in our table as forming the Sakala Jivas.) And in fact the Personal God whom our learned contributor defines and describes is in fact none other than this Nirguna Being. The Christian ideal of God is also that He is the creator of heaven and earth, the only one Truth and Light and Intelligence and changeless substance who loves and cherishes His creatures and who is the bridge to immortality and who is different from His creatures. The Personal God of the Christian Theology does not mean a Being who undergoes change, is clothed in a material body as ourselves, who is born and dies (though they speak of one incarnation for all time to come) ever and anon, who has eyes and hands senses as we have and whose intelligence and will and power is finite and limited as ours is. Of course we have to point out also, as some have supposed falsely that of the Nirguna Being, even Satchidananda cannot be predicated (if so where is the Being itself and what remains of it at all and all our Reverend Father's denunciations on the Impersonal God will apply even with greater force) that It is not Knowledge (consciousness) and Power (Gnana, Kiriya Swarupam) and that It is not the author of creation and destruction and grace and that this Nirguna God can neither know and love us nor can we love and know Him either. All these and more are no doubt stated as an article of faith by the so-called Vedantists but the Editor of the *Light of the East* (a staunch Vedantist) ranks them as gross materialists and atheists ; and we have quoted direct texts to show otherwise. Some of these so-called Vedantists also claim to have reached the knowledge of the highest if only when they have learnt to speak of God in the neuter, as 'It,' 'That' and '*Brahman*' and when they regard Him as formless and nameless. Nothing can be a greater delusion than this. This 'It' of theirs is nothing but Jiva after all and one with the Universe. Says the Swami, "so the whole is the absolute, but within it every particle is in a constant state of flux and change, unchangeable and changeable at the same time, Impersonal and Personal in one. This is our conception of the Universe, of motion and of God and this is what is meant by 'Thou art That.' This may be what the Swami holds as true but this is what we hold to be Pasa and Pasugnanam, Materialism and Anthropomorphism. The Swami glibly enough talks of the *absolute and its particles* and the unchangeable and changeable Brahman. But did he forget the Vedic mantra that God is "partless, actionless and tranquil." And the Swami's guru fitly enough talks of Maya and Brahman to be one. And what is Materialism pray ? And then what is this much vaunted attribute of Achala and Nirchala (unchangeability) worth when its every particle is undergoing change ? Man is seated and at perfect rest. Yet so many of his muscles and nerves are in the utmost active condition and undergoing change and destruction and the particles of his whole body are also undergoing change, destruction and reconstruction, and his thoughts may wander and wander and create waste in the animal tissues. A pool of water may be at perfect rest but a single breath of wind can cause motion in every particle and we do not call water a stable element ; and we do not aspire ourselves to the condition of rest and freedom we described above. This is only a make believe rest and stability. So we must rate the Brahman (unchangeable and changing) of the Swami as only a being, (every chalana being undergoes rest at short or long intervals, out of sheer exhaustion) wilful, inconstant and unstable the mere toy of every passing whim, every passing breath. The Infinite and Limitless God whom the *Brahmavadin* pourtrays in such glowing colours to mislead the credulous few, whose throne is space, and whose Queen is time and who is limitless and infinite as space and time are limitless, must also share a similar ignoble fate. We never thought that we would have to corret our learned brother in regard to such a simple thing as that the very notion of time and space implies both limitation and finiteness. We have no need to turn over big treatises to find authorities for this statement. There is lying before us a small and well written pamphlet of Dr. Peebles of America, entitled 'The Soul'. In the very opening paragraph, we find the following lines, only to show what a trite notion it has now become, "All beginnings in time and space necessarily have their endings. A creature which has its beginning in time is incapable of perpetuating itself or of being perpetuated through eternity. A line projected from a point in space has a further limit which no logic can carry to infinity." We have on another occasion pointed out that Infinite space and limitless time are contradictions in words. The absolute can never involve itself in space and time. If it does, there is no use of calling it the absolute and unconditioned. And our brother is quite

right in saying that Knowledge of This Brahman is only a misnomer (a myth we should say). Then again (in same page 587), our brother says that the Brahman (It) is 'formless for all forms imply a boundary'. Vainest of delusions. But does fromlessness imply no boundary? So many things in nature are invisible and have no form. If by formless is meant unextended, such as mind &c., we know mind as a product of Maya is also limited. But by formless they generally mean 'Arupi,' 'invisible' and visibility is no great attribute after all, as matter can also be formless and invisible. We have elsewhere pointed out the mistake of taking Form and formless as being respectively equivalent to Personal and Impersonal. To deny to God that he can take form is to deny his Omnipotence and limit his nature. The distinction is from our stand point. When we begin to identify him with anything we can know from the lowest tatwa to ourselves (A'tma), then this is Anthropomorphic. The distinction does not rest on calling the supreme, as '*Siva,*' or '*Sivah*' or '*Sivam.*' 'He' 'She' or 'It.'(.)God has form. The Srutis declare so. God is formless, so also the Srutis say. He has form and has no form. This is because, his body is not formed of matter but is pure Chit, or Intelligence It is when we make God enter a material body, and say that he is born and dies, then it is we blaspheme Him and humanize Him and our conception becomes Anthropomorphic. Some of the so-called Vedantists who are unable to distinguish between what constitutes God's real nature and Anthropomorphism and Hindu symbolism mistake the ideal of God according to Saiva Siddhanta. Do they care to understand why when describing God, they say He is neither male nor female nor neuter, neither he, she nor it, neither Rupi, Arupi nor Ruparupi, and yet when they address God, He is called, Siva, Sivah or Sivam, 'Rupam Krishna Pingalam,' and worshipped as the invisible air and Akas. Professor Max Muller points out how with bewildering perplexity the gender varies frequently from the masculine to the neuter in the Swetaswatara. Well, in the passage 'it has feet and hands everywhere,' if the neuter Brahman can have feet, why could not the Being with the feet &c. be described as He also. We describe all inanimate creation as it, and when we proceed to call the Supreme as It also, we transcend from Saguna to Nirguna !!! We have already cautioned against mistaking the Sakti of the Saiva Siddhanta to be Maya. It is this mistake that has been the fruitful source of all the degradation and vice of the northern *Vamachara*. This Sakti is called most frequently in Tamil '*Arul Sakti*' (God's manifestation as Love or Grace) and the greatness of this '*Arul*' is thus beautifully described by Thirumular.—

" அருளெங்குமானவளவையறியார்
அருளை றகரமுதானதும்தேரார்
அருளைங்கருமத்ததிசூக்கமுன்னோர்
அருளெங்கும்கண்ணானதாரறிவாரே."

" Who knows the Power of this Arul by which Omnipresence is secured?
Who understands that this Love transmuted Herself into tasteful ambrosia?
Who thinks that this Love permeates subtiley the five great operations (Panchakritya)?
Who knows that this Love has eyes on all sides (is Omniscient.)?"

அருளிற் பிறந்திட் டருளில் வளர்ந்திட்டு
அருளி லழிந்திளைப் பாறி, மறைந்திட்டு,
அருளான வானந்தத் தாரமு தூட்டி
அருளாலென்னந்தி அகம்புகுந்தானே.

" Born in Love, Bred up in Love,
Changing, and resting in Love
Fed in the Supreme ambrosia like Love
The Nandi entered me as Love."

He says elsewhere that none knows that Love and God are the same. To go and identify this Supreme Love of God, which, like the emerald, covers everything with Her own Love and imparts to each and every one its own peculiar beauty and power and grace and will, to Maya, which like darkness plunges everything into ignorance death is real blasphemy and prostitution indeed. We will stop here the discussion so far as the Saguna and Nirguna is concerned and glance at the controversy as regards Personal and Impersonal God. It is not very easy to get at the precise definition of these terms and the quarrel seems to be more often a quarrel over words. One author for instance says that by Personality is implied and involved mortality, corporeality (material,) human volitionality. Another says that personality involves limitation. Is this so, and is this the proper conotation and denotation of the word? If so, no body need pause that God cannot be personal. But eminent men like Emerson and others say that it does not mean any such thing. To quote again Dr. Peebles, " Personality in its common and outward acceptation is usually associated with appearance and outward character; but such writers as Emerson, James Freeman Clarke, Frohschammer, Elisha Mulford, Lotze etc. Personality has a far deeper meaning. The Latins

used *Person* to signify personating, counterfeiting or wearing a mask. But Personality in the sense in which Emerson employs it signifies *true Being both concrete and spiritual.* It alone is original Being. It is not limited. Personality is that universal element that pervades every human soul and which is at once its continent and fount of Being. Distinction from others and limitation by them results from Individuality not Personality ... ... Personality therefore pertains to the substance of the soul and individuality to its form." And the Rev. J. Iverach also controverts very ably in his work. 'Is God knowable' the idea of Personality as at first stated, and argues also that to say that the absolute and the unconditioned Being is Personal is not a contradiction in terms such as a round square but that it will be true as when we say a white or crimson square. " When we speak of the absolute we speak of it as a predicate of Pure Being, and what we mean simply is that the absolute is complete in itself; it has no conditions save the conditions contained in itself. When we speak of personality we ascribe to it being, regarded as pure spiritual being; and we simply mean that absolute personal being is and must be self conscious, rational and ethical; must answer to the idea of spirit. Why may not the absolute Being be self-conscious? To deny this to Him would be to deny to Him one of the perfections which even finite beings may have? And Saint Meikanda Deva asked the same question several centuries before—(Sivagnabotham, XI-Sutra 1-*b*). And our Saint Thirumular also states the question in similar terms.

நானறிந்தன்றே யிருக்கின்ற தீசனை
வானறிந்தாரறியாது மயங்கினர்
ஊனறிந்துள்ளேயுயிர்க்கின்றவொண்சுடர்
தானறியான்பின்னையாரறிவாரே ?

That day I knew my God; the same was not understood by the Devas. The Bright Effulgence lighting *inside of* my body and soul, it is said, does not know. *Who else can know then?*

We will stop here for the present. We accept the view of Personality as set forth by Emerson and others, in which case we must reject the notion of an impersonal, unintelligent and unconscious, unknown and unknowable, unloveable and unloving nothing. The Christians and Mahomedans (there are some Sagunavatis among them also) have no need to fall shy of the Nirguna conception, though the Ramanujas, and Madhwas whose God being identified with Prakriti itself (Vasudeva Para Prakriti) can never rise above the Saguna Satvic conception. Some of the Vedantists halting between two stools contrive to fall most miserably and their view of a God, both Nirguna, Saguna, Personal and Impersonal is what we have no good language to describe. None need be ashamed to proclaim truth if it is truth. Why undertake the trouble of praising Krishna and his teaching to the skies, to say after all that Krishna (the late Mr. T. Subba Row stated more plainly that he cannot be the incarnation of the absolute) is only for such who wish to be born again and again and who consider the service of God as their Highest Felicity and Brahman is for those whose gool is perfect rest in freedom. These very people will raise a howl if the Saiva were to state the same truth, which by the way was stated long ago by Sri Krishna himself, that worship of Siva or Sivam alone would secure Sayujya (Moksha) and the worship of other Gods (Ishwaras, Brahma, Vishnu Rudra &c.) would only secure their respective worlds (Pada). There are some more questions which arise out of this discussion and we reserve them for a future occasion.

THE POETS OF THE TAMIL LANDS.

(*From the Asiatic Quarterly Review.*)

KABILAR AND HIS FRIEND VELPARI.

I. HISTORICAL GLIMPSES

OF this renowned poet of Tamil antiquity much is said, written, and (more or less) believed; but little is really ascertained. His *Agaval* in some shape or other is familar to every one, but no one knows the exact germ from which it has grown. In the *Purra-nanurru* thirty of his poems are found, of which we shall give some account. He is especially renowned as the intimate and faithful friend of King Pari. His contemporaries are said to have been the Madura bards *Nakkiranàr* and *Paranar*. The name KABILAR is very celebrated in Sanskrit tradition. It is a name of Vishnu, and means "the tawny-coloured one," as Vishnu was dark, and Kabilar (probably, from the account of his parentage) may have been so likewise. The founder of the Sankhya philosophy was also called by this name, and was supposed to be an incarnation of the deity. In these poems he is referred to by other poets with profoundest respect as the "Brahman of unspotted learning" (126); as "Kabilar, who in rapid verse poured forth poetry full of varied lore correct of

speech, of far extended praise" (53); and as 'Kabilar whose tongue never uttered falsehood" (174).

In one of his pieces (106) there is a remarkable idea :

" Our God whate'er his worshippers devout can find to bring:
Accepts ; rejects not wreath of commonest flowers ;—
So Pari though folks ignorant and mean draw near
As suppliants, bestows on all his liberal gifts."

We shall see that Avvai was supposed to be his sister. This does not seem probable, or even possible; but there is something in his verses that reminds one forcibly of her. They seem both of them to have had strong practical good sense, and a very genial way of looking at life. I could almost fancy them brother and sister.

He wrote in praise of several kings, for it was as a wandering minstrel that he chiefly gained his livelihood. One of these chieftains ruled over the Sera kingdom, and was called Seraman-kadumko-Variya-than. He is said to have rewarded him with large treasures and much land. This king one day, taking his hand and feeling it, asked him, "Why is your hand so soft?" The answer was a lyric of nineteen lines (14).

"O brave king, urging on your war elephants, you have broken down the strongholds of your foe ; with well-wrought iron goad you have driven them on to bear the brunt of the fierce fight ; you have guided your charger over the moat and fortifications of your enemies' citadel ; riding on stately chariot, your side bearing the quiver, you have bent your bow, and shot forth deadly arrows ; and on suppliants have you with liberal hand bestowed your gifts. Thus strong and mighty is your broad hand that reaches to your foot !* We know no other toil than the eating of savoury curry and rice prepared by your beneficence amidst rich perfumes ; and so, mighty one, who art like the conquering Murugan, our hands are soft !"

Another of his pieces on the same king is somewhat hyperbolical (8) :

"O Sun, thou canst not rival Seralathan whom all obey, who brooks no rival, who bestows lavish gifts, who is the lord of conquering hosts; for thou must bide thy time to shine, dost turn thy back at eventide, dost change thy place from hour to hour, dost hide thyself behind the hills, dost only in the day season shine in the broad expanse of heaven."

2. Pari.

But the best of his songs are connected with Pari, who was a very celebrated king of the south, always enumerated among the seven most liberal of the later petty rulers in South India.

The following is at least picturesque.

Pari's Mountain Home. (P. N. N. 109.)

" Sad indeed is Pàri's mountain home !
Though ye three Kings with sound of dreaded drum besiege,
Untill'd four kinds of produce rich it bears.
And first, the *bamboo** with its tiny leaf yields rice-like grain ;
The second is the *jack-fruit's*† sweet and pulpy store ;
The third, the root of the rich *valli's*‡ creeping plant ;
The fourth, *honey* dripping were squirrels leap
From tree to tree on the long line of lofty hills,
His mount soars like the sky. The brooks
That murmer on their slopes are bright as stars of heaven.
Though ye had elephants to tie to every tree,
And chariots covering every field,
By valour shall ye ne'er obtain the hill !
No sword shall gain the prize !
I know the way to win his hill from him ;
Take ye the tiny lute, and sing sweet songs,—
Maidens with wealth of fragrant locks,—
Come but with dance and song, you'll gain the country all
and every hill !"

This chieftain's fortress was on a hill called *Parrambu* (109), and he held 300 villages around it ; but so great was his generosity that he left himself at length nothing but his fortress (110). § The three kings, the Pandian, the Soran, and the Seran, whom he had often defeated in battle, besieged his fortress, but were unable to take it. It is said that they slew him with guile, but the particulars are not transmitted to us. It rather seems probable that he became an ascetic, and died "in the north." He had two daughters who are among the Singers of the time. Pari himself was no mean poet. His death left the Princesses, who were very young and unmarried, entirely dependent upon their late father's friend and minstrel *Kabilar*, a number of whose songs relating to his beloved master are contained in this collection.

The following is one of them, which gives a true picture of Pari's hill (105) :

"O bright-browed damsel! thou shalt obtain ornaments of ruddy gold, if thou go to Pari to sing his praise ; he is more propitious than the streams that from the peaks of the chain of hills that rise like the steps of a *bamboo* ladder, flow down through the channel of the broad fields that receive the mountain torrent, that never dries up, whether it rain or no ; while the cool drops fall refreshing on the young lily flowers with their expanded leaves, around which the beetles hum."

* This is a favourite expression in these lyrics. It is a commendation of a king that standing upright he can touch at least his knee, some say his ankles, with the tips of his fingers ! This is said to have been the case with the great *Sivaji*. It would almost point to a descent from the far-famed ancestral ape !

* The *Bambusa Arundinacea* yields a seed which is sometimes eaten instead of rice.

† The fruit of the *Artocarpus integrifolia* is largely eaten. The seeds when parched and pounded make a kind of flour.

‡ *Dioscorea*. The yam, or sweet potato.

§ A curious tradition says that he gave a chariot to the Jessamine Mullai : *Jasminum Trichotomum*, or "November flower" (Pp. III, 88); but what this precisely signifies no one seems to know. I rather infer that it was some female minstrel of the name.